



5M, INC., P.O. BOX 752, HURRICANE, UTAH 84737 (801) 635-4473



July 12, 1978

Mr. Brian W. Buck
Engineering Geologist
Division of Oil, Gas, & Mining
1588 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

Dear Mr. Buck:

In response to your letter of June 20, 1978, the following comments are submitted, herewith, and accord with the paragraph numbering used in your letter.

1. We concur that backfilling during both the open pit and underground mining operations will be complicated. Therefore, we feel your suggestions as set forth in this paragraph wherein portals should be spaced as far apart as possible, and with backfilling being temporarily held off at these few locations, to be a better method.

2. 5M, Inc. has not proposed at this time to conduct mining operations under any residence.

3. Concur.

4. Concur.

5. The suggestions made in (a) through (c) deserve the upmost consideration, and all blasting will be in accordance with the prescribed safety regulations and measures, including those of the Industrial Commission. 5M, Inc. at this time is in process of obtaining a Federal Explosive Permit.

6(a)(b) With reference to the NRC requirements regarding drainage into the holding pond, 5M, Inc. has elected at this time not to proceed with the production of uranium yellow cake at this site.

Evaluations just completed by 5M, Inc. with the NRC, and companies providing engineering services and the Environmental Base-line Study, have shown that an alternative site is better adapted for the processing of the uranium bearing ores. Accordingly, the R&D permit application to the

Minerals-Mining-Milling-Melting-Manufacturing

Mr. Brian W. Buck
July 12, 1978
Page TWO



NRC is not now applicable to this site. However, 5M, Inc. will move forward at the present site for the approval to process the copper and silver ores.

With reference to your comment whereby you state that the Division would deem adequate a design for drainage and facilities based upon the 100 year, 6 hour storm, estimated at 565 cfs, requiring a diversion ditch eight (8) feet wide at the base, 2h:lv side slopes, and a 2.5 foot depth, we have the following comments:

(1) Riprap. You say it should be two (2) feet in diameter. Is this to be grouted or ungrouted riprap? If it is to be grouted, why the large size riprap?

(2) Is 7.5 inches of asphalt not to be considered as a sufficient drainage base material?

6(c) The possible thunderstorm applied to the heap leach materials would be welcomed inasmuch as the porous ores of sandstone material would absorb without difficulty the 7.5 inch rainfall. Also, the dams are being designed, engineered, and constructed to handle this rainfall without failure to the dam.

6(d) Concur.

7. Design, engineering, construction, and operation of the spray system will provide for any concern in atmospheric discharge.

We are most appreciative of the comments set forth in your letter. It is our desire to resolve each problem and assist as we can in coordinating this program with you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jerry Glazier".

Jerry Glazier
President

JG:s